

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 2, 2006 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 4 and 9 have been amended. Claims 5, 7 and 10 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 9 are pending. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,555,647 to *Torborg et al.* (hereinafter “*Torborg*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), “the reference must teach each and every element of the claim.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Torborg* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-3. Specifically, *Torborg* fails to disclose a chamfer between a fan and a motor and parallel to each other, the chamfer configured for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft. Accordingly, *Torborg* cannot anticipate these claims.

Nevertheless, the Office Action alleges that *Torborg* teaches “a chamfer 33 disposed between the fan and the motor, the chamfer facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft wherein the disclosed flat portion of shaft 33 shown in figure 5 is considered to anticipate the claimed chamfer.” The Applicant respectfully disagrees. A chamfer is a beveled edge, that is an edge inclined or oblique (i.e., not perpendicular) with respect to the shaft motor shaft. (See e.g., Fig. 5.) The flat portion of shaft 33 has edges that are perpendicular to the shaft. Therefore, the flat portion of shaft 33 cannot by definition be a chamfer. In addition, *Torborg* does not discuss or suggest that the flat portion of shaft 33 facilitates the removal of a fan from the motor shaft. Instead, the flat portion described by *Torborg* is used to attach the fan. Also, the Office Action states, “[c]hamfer is a term well known in the art of drive shafts to be a portion of the shaft allowing a clamping configuration as discussed in LeFlar, Pool or Kennedy in an earlier action.”

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The plain and ordinary meaning of “chamfer” as stated above, is a beveled, inclined or oblique edge. Also, as stated above, the prior art does not teach or suggest a motor shaft comprising an oblique, inclined or beveled edge. This includes LeFlar, Pool and Kennedy, none of which discloses a “chamfer” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, according to Torborg (column 6, lines 24 to 31), Torborg discloses a flat portion 33 aligned or indexing the opening in the wheel hub portion 48 with the blower wheel hub portion 48 properly. The flat portion 33 must be formed on the blower drive shaft 34 positioned in the blower housing 26. Therefore, the flat portion 33 does not correspond to the chamfers of the claimed invention. Also, Torborg does not disclose the chamfers parallel to each other and configured for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft. Therefore, Torborg does not teach each and every limitation of claims 1-3. As such, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,264,016 to *Reisch*. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As stated above, in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), “the reference must teach each and every element of the claim.” Applicant respectfully submits that *Reisch* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 9.

Claim 9 recites, “wherein the motor shaft includes chamfers parallel to each other configured for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft.” *Reisch* does not show this feature. Therefore, *Reisch* cannot anticipate claim 9.

The Office Action states that *Reisch* “clearly anticipates” claim 9. No other information is provided by the Examiner regarding *Reisch*. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The groove 18 in the shaft described by *Reisch* facilitates the stability of the connection between a shaft and a hub. There is no discussion in *Reisch* of a chamfer, nor is there a discussion of any

other component that facilitates the removal of the fan from the motor shaft. Accordingly, *Reisch* does not anticipate claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,555,647 to *Torborg* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,664,936 to *Cunha et al.* (hereinafter “*Cunha*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of *Torborg* in view of *Cunha et al.* either singularly or in combination, does not disclose or suggest all the elements recited in claims 4, 6 and 8.

Claim 4 defines a laundry dryer comprising among other features a motor shaft that includes “a chamfer between the motor and the motor bracket configured and parallel each other, the chamfer configured for cooperating with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft.” Neither *Torborg* or *Cunha*, either in singularity or in combination show this feature.

Nevertheless, the Office Action concludes that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of *Torborg* with the chamfer disposed between the motor and motor bracket, considered disclosed in *Cunha*. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Torborg* does not teach or suggest a chamfer. As stated above, a chamfer is a beveled, inclined or oblique edge. *Torborg* at best teaches a flat portion and not a beveled, inclined or oblique portion. Accordingly, *Torborg* cannot possibly teach a chamfer between a motor and a motor bracket. *Torborg*’s deficiencies are not overcome by *Cunha*. *Cunha* teaches away from the claimed invention as the point of the engaging recess 21 is to mount the central hub 10 to the shaft end 20. *Cunha*’s structure can not be interpreted as cooperating with a tool to prevent the

shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the shaft. Therefore, neither *Torborg* or *Cunha* disclose this feature. Accordingly, claim 4, and claims 6-8 which depend from claim 4, are patentable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejects claims 1-4, 6, and 8-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,874,248 to *Hong et al.* (hereinafter "*Hong*") in view of either *Torborg*, *Reisch*, and/or *Cunha*. The Applicant traverses the rejection.

No other information is provided by the Examiner regarding *Hong*. There is no discussion in *Hong* of a chamfer, nor is there a discussion of a chamfer or any other component that facilitates the removal of the fan from the motor shaft.

The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest all the features of the claims 1-4, 6 and 8-9. As clearly pointed out above, neither *Torborg*, *Reisch*, nor *Cunha* singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest the chamfer as recited in the claims 1-4, 6 and 8-9. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6 and 8-9 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant's representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: September 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
Attorney for Applicants

DC:50425338.1